

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 and 16-51 were pending in the application. Claims 12, 24-26, 32-34, and 39-41 have been canceled and claims 1, 9, 13, 18, 21, 23, 31, 38, 45 and 51 have been amended without acquiescence in the Office Action's basis for rejections or prejudice to pursue in a related application. No new matter has been added. The amendments should be entered because they were discussed with the Examiner, and the Examiner indicated during the telephone conversation that the amendments place the claims in condition for allowance.

TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the telephone call dated November 4, 2010. Claims 1, 9, 13, 18, 21, 23, 31, 38, 45 and 51 and Robertson, Smith and Williams, Jr., were specifically discussed. The Examiner suggested amendments that would place the claims in condition for allowance. The claims have been amended as suggested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS -35 USC 103

All pending claims have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson et al. (USP 5,631,635) in view of Smith et al. (USP 6,282,564) and further in view of William, Jr. (USP 4,868,866).

Claim 1, and similarly claims 13, 21, 23, 31, 38 and 45, explicitly recites "associating a work list table with said history table, said work list table comprising one or more work entries; batching two or more work entries in said work list table; reading one or more history records of said history table, said one or more history records determined by said two or more work entries; deleting the one or more information records".

Robertson is directed to a two way pager that utilizes a tracking table. The paging messages of Robertson are tracked by the tracking table. Robertson does not disclose or suggest associating a work list table with history table as claimed. Robertson alerts a user of a page message for the user based on comparing the user's device address and stored address. Comparing addresses does not associate the tables as claimed. Thus, Robertson does not disclose "associating a work list table with said history table, said work list table comprising one or more work entries; batching two or more work entries in said work list table; reading one or

more history records of said history table, said one or more history records determined by said two or more work entries; deleting the one or more information records” (emphasis added).

Smith is directed to method of maintaining database records. The Office action states Smith teaches updating history record. Smith is silent with associating the tables as claimed. Therefore, Smith also does not disclose “associating a work list table with said history table, said work list table comprising one or more work entries; batching two or more work entries in said work list table; reading one or more history records of said history table, said one or more history records determined by said two or more work entries; deleting the one or more information records”.

Williams, Jr. is directed a broadcast data distribution system. The Office action states Williams, Jr. teaches allowing other consumers to access a message. Smith is silent with associating the tables as claimed. Therefore, Williams, Jr. also does not disclose “associating a work list table with said history table, said work list table comprising one or more work entries; batching two or more work entries in said work list table; reading one or more history records of said history table, said one or more history records determined by said two or more work entries; deleting the one or more information records”.

Therefore, Robertson, Smith and Williams, Jr., singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention as a whole.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, all claims are believed allowable, and an allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

To the extent that any arguments and disclaimers were presented to distinguish prior art, or for other reasons substantially related to patentability, during the prosecution of any and all parent and related application(s)/patent(s), Applicant(s) hereby explicitly retracts and rescinds any and all such arguments and disclaimers, and respectfully requests that the Examiner re-visit the prior art that such arguments and disclaimers were made to avoid.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Vista IP Law Group's Deposit Account No. 50-1105, referencing billing number OID 1998-015-01. The Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment or to charge any underpayment to Vista IP Law Group's Deposit Account No. 50-1105, referencing billing number OID 1998-015-01.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 3, 2010

Vista IP Law Group LLP
1885 Lundy Avenue,
Suite 108
San Jose, CA 95131
Telephone: (408) 321-8663

By: /Jasper Kwoh/
Jasper Kwoh
Registration No. 54,921
for
Peter C. Mei
Registration No. 39,768